

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| WESLEY MCCOY, #1687741, | § | |
| | § | |
| | § | |
| Plaintiff, | § | |
| | § | Lead Case: 6:22-cv-100 |
| v. | § | |
| | § | Consolidated Case: 6:22-cv-101 |
| DAVID A. STEBBINS, et al., | § | |
| | § | |
| Defendants. | § | |
| | § | |
| | § | |

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Wesley McCoy, a Texas Department of Criminal Justice inmate proceeding pro se, filed these two civil rights lawsuits pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The cases were consolidated and referred to United States Magistrate Judge John D. Love for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition.

On July 11, 2022, Judge Love issued a Report recommending that the Court dismiss these cases without prejudice for Plaintiff's failure to comply with a Court order. Docket No. 18. Specifically, Judge Love found that—after granting multiple extensions of time in which to comply—Plaintiff failed to submit a properly certified data sheet or trust fund statement from the prison. A copy of this Report was sent to Plaintiff at his last-known address. To date, however, Plaintiff has neither filed objections nor a data sheet/trust fund account statement as ordered.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and

Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), superseded on other grounds by statute, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Plaintiff did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), cert. denied, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 18) as the findings of this Court. It is therefore **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's claims in these consolidated cases are **DISMISSED** without prejudice for failure to comply with an order of the Court.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **26th** day of **August, 2022**.



JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE